Performance Summary



SUMMARY OF PERFORMANCE RESULTS

In FY 2009, the measures provided in this report are measures that provide an overall assessment of the Department's progress in improving the educational system, based on the *Strategic Plan for Fiscal Years 2007–2012.* A new strategic plan that reflects the current administration's framework for education reform will be reviewed and published during fiscal year (FY) 2010 and will be the basis for annual performance reporting for FY 2010. For more information on the Department's strategic planning process, as well as a goal-by-goal summary of strategic objectives and resources, see

http://www.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/2009report/2e-mda-performance.pdf.

Each year, the Department assesses measures for that year's performance plan and evaluates the utility and appropriateness of those measures. As a result, the measures are continued, replaced or completely removed from the objective measurement process. This assessment process provides a method for continued improvement in Department programs.

Shown on the following pages are the results for each measure as of December 2009. The table shows whether the result met or exceeded, did not meet but improved over the prior years or failed to meet the expected target. The shaded areas indicate that a measure was not in place or that no data were available during this time period. In some cases, establishing a baseline is the target and the target is recognized as met if the data are available and the baseline has been established. For measures for which data are not currently available, the date the data are expected to be available has been indicated.

The table on the following pages summarizes the Department's performance results for FY 2009 measures. There are 81 performance measures that support the Department's mission and strategic goals. Most data for FY 2009 will be available during FY 2010.

In FY 2008, the year with the most available data, the Department met or exceeded targets for 31 measures (38.3 percent), did not meet but showed improvement for 26 (32.1 percent), did not meet 11 (13.6 percent), and is awaiting data for 7 measures (8.6 percent). The remaining 6 (7.4 percent) have no targets or data for FY 2008. Targets for FY 2008 are listed next to each measure that has a numerical target to provide a context for the results. FY 2009 targets are available in the Performance Details section of the report, but are not used here because a majority of the FY 2009 data is not available.

Performance Results for FY 2009 Measures

		Performance Results Summary	FY 2009	FY 2008	FY 2007
Stra read	tegi ling	c Goal 1—Improve student achievement, with a focus on bringing and mathematics by 2014	all students	s to grade le	evel in
1.1.		prove student achievement in reading			
	A.	Percentage of all students who achieve proficiency on state reading assessments [Target: 76.2% for FY 2008]	Sept. 2010	Not met*	Not met*
	B.	Percentage of low-income students who achieve proficiency on state reading assessments [Target: 66.5% for FY 2008]	Sept. 2010	Not met*	Not met*
	C.	Percentage of American Indian/Alaska Native students who achieve proficiency on state reading assessments [Target: 70.1% for FY 2008]	Sept. 2010	Not met	Not met*
	D.	Percentage of African American students who achieve proficiency on state reading assessments [Target: 66.6% for FY 2008]	Sept. 2010	Not met	Not met*
	E.	Percentage of Hispanic students who achieve proficiency on state reading assessments [Target: 64.0% for FY 2008]	Sept. 2010	Not met*	Not met*
	F.	Percentage of students with disabilities who achieve proficiency on state reading assessments [Target: 54.0% for FY 2008]	Sept. 2010	Not met*	Not met*
	G.	Percentage of Limited English Proficient students who achieve proficiency on state reading assessments [Target: 54.9% for FY 2008]	Sept. 2010	Not met*	Not met
	H.	Percentage of career and technical education concentrators who are proficient in reading [Target: 61% for FY 2008]	May 2010	Met	NA
1.2.	Imp	prove student achievement in mathematics			
	A.	Percentage of all students who achieve proficiency on state mathematics assessments [Target: 73.8% for FY 2008]	Sept. 2010	Not met*	Not met*
	B.	Percentage of low-income students who achieve proficiency on state mathematics assessments [Target: 64.2% for FY 2008]	Sept. 2010	Not met*	Not met*
	C.	Percentage of American Indian/Alaska Native students who achieve proficiency on state mathematics assessments [Target: 64.9% for FY 2008]	Sept. 2010	Not met*	Not met*
	D.	Percentage of African American students who achieve proficiency on state mathematics assessments [Target: 61.6%for FY 2008]	Sept. 2010	Not met*	Not met*
	E.	Percentage of Hispanic students who achieve proficiency on state mathematics assessments [Target: 63.9% for FY 2008]	Sept. 2010	Not met*	Not met*
	F.	Percentage of students with disabilities who achieve proficiency on state mathematics assessments [Target: 53.3% for FY 2008]	Sept. 2010	Not met*	Not met*
	G.	Percentage of Limited English Proficient students who achieve proficiency on state mathematics assessments [Target: 57.5% for FY 2008]	Sept. 2010	Not met*	Not met*

NA = No measure for period

Key:

* Not met but improved over prior years

** Data not collected

	Performance Results Summary	FY 2009	FY 2008	FY 2007		
H.	Percentage of career and technical education concentrators who are proficient in mathematics [Target: 54% for FY 2008]	May 2010	Met	NA		
	Improve teacher quality					
A.	Percentage of total core academic classes taught by highly qualified teachers [Target: 100% for FY 2008]	Mar. 2010	Not met*	Not met*		
B.	Percentage of total core elementary classes taught by highly qualified teachers [Target: 100% for FY 2008]	Mar. 2010	Not met*	Not met*		
C.	Percentage of core elementary classes in high-poverty schools taught by highly qualified teachers [Target: 100% for FY 2008]	Mar. 2010	Not met*	Not met*		
D.	Percentage of core elementary classes in low-poverty schools taught by highly qualified teachers [Target: 100% for FY 2008]	Mar. 2010	Not met*	Not met*		
E.	Percentage of total core secondary classes taught by highly qualified teachers [Target: 100% for FY 2008]	Mar. 2010	Not met*	Not met*		
F.	Percentage of core secondary classes in high-poverty schools taught by highly qualified teachers [Target: 100% for FY 2008]	Mar. 2010	Not met*	Not met*		
G.	Percentage of core secondary classes in low-poverty schools taught by highly qualified teachers [Target: 100% for FY 2008]	Mar. 2010	Not met*	Not met*		
1.4. Pr	omote safe, disciplined and drug-free learning environments		•			
A.	Percentage of students in grades 9 through 12 who carried a weapon (such as a knife, gun, or club) on school property one or more times during the past 30 days	Aug. 2010	NA	Not met*		
B.	Percentage of students in grades 9 through 12 who missed one or more days of school during the past 30 days because they felt unsafe at school, or on their way to and from school	Aug. 2010	NA	Not met*		
C.	Percentage of students in grades 9 through 12 who were offered, given, or sold an illegal drug by someone on school property in the past year	Aug. 2010	NA	Met		
1.5. In	crease information and options for parents					
	Percentage of eligible students exercising choice [Target: 2.4% for FY 2008]	Jan. 2010	Not met*	Met		
В.	Percentage of eligible students participating in supplemental educational services [Target: 16.8% for FY 2008]	Jan. 2010	Not met	Not met*		
C.	Number of charter schools in operation [Target: 4,290 for FY 2008]	Feb. 2010	Met	Met		
	crease high school completion rate					
A.	Percentage of total 18–24-year-olds who have completed high school [Target: 87.4% for FY 2008]	Jul. 2011	Jul. 2010	Met		
В.	Percentage of African American 18–24-year-olds who have completed high school [Target: 88.5% for FY 2008]	Jul. 2011	Jul. 2010	Met		

NA = No measure for period

Key:
* Not met but improved over prior years
** Data not collected
** No measure for period

		Performance Results Summary	FY 2009	FY 2008	FY 2007
	C.	Percentage of Hispanic 18–24-year-olds who have completed high school [Target: 70.3% for FY 2008]	Jul. 2011	Jul. 2010	Met
	D.	Averaged freshman graduation rate [Target: 76.6% for FY 2008]	Jul. 2011	Jul. 2010	Not met*
1.7.	Tra	nsform education into an evidence-based field			
	A.	Number of Department-supported reading or writing programs and practices with evidence of efficacy using What Works Clearinghouse standards [Target: 11 for FY 2008]	Met	Met	Met
	B.	Number of Department-supported mathematics or science programs and practices with evidence of efficacy using What Works Clearinghouse standards [Target: 7 for FY 2008]	Met	Met	Met
	C.	Number of Department-supported teacher quality programs and practices with evidence of efficacy using What Works Clearinghouse standards [Target: 5 for FY 2008]	Met	Met	Met
	D.	Number of visits to the What Works Clearinghouse Web site [Target: 530,000 for FY 2008]	Met	Met	Met
Strat	tegio	Goal 2—Increase the academic achievement of all high school s	students		
2.1.	Incr	ease the proportion of high school students taking a rigorous curriculu	ım		
		Percentage of low-income students who qualify for Academic Competitiveness Grants [Target: 42% for FY 2008]	Sept. 2010	Not met	Met
	B.	Number of Advanced Placement classes available nationwide	**	**	**
	C.	Number of Advanced Placement tests taken by all public school students [Target: 2,168,000 for FY 2008]	Met	Met	Met
	D.	Number of Advanced Placement tests taken by low-income public school students [Target: 328,932 for FY 2008]	Met	Not met*	Met
		Number of Advanced Placement tests taken by minority (Black, Hispanic, Native American) public school students [Target: 421,000 for FY 2008]	Not met*	Met	Met
	F.	Number of teachers trained through Advanced Placement Incentive grants to teach Advanced Placement classes	**	**	**
2.2.	Pro	mote advanced proficiency in mathematics and science for all student	S		
	A.	Number of Advanced Placement tests in mathematics and science taken nationwide by all public school students [Target: 681,000 for FY 2008]	Not met*	Met	Met
		Number of Advanced Placement tests in mathematics and science taken nationwide by low-income public school students [Target: 70,000 for FY 2008]	Met	Met	Met
		Number of Advanced Placement tests in mathematics and science taken nationwide by minority (Black, Hispanic, Native American) public school students [Target: 86,000 for FY 2008]	Met	Met	Met

Key:

* Not met but improved over prior years

** Data not collected

NA = No measure for period

	Performance Results Summary	FY 2009	FY 2008	FY 2007
	D. Number of teachers trained through Advanced Placement Incentive grants to teach Advanced Placement classes in mathematics and science	**	**	**
2.3.	Increase proficiency in critical foreign languages			
	A. Combined total number of Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate tests in critical foreign languages passed by public school students [Target: 4,091 for FY 2008]	Met	Not met*	Met
	egic Goal 3—Ensure the accessibility, affordability and accountability are students and adults for employment and future learning	y of higher	education a	nd better
3.1.	Increase success in and completion of quality postsecondary education			
	Percentage of high school graduates aged 16–24 enrolling immediately in college [Target: 68% for FY 2008]	Dec. 2010	Not met*	Not met
	B. Percentage of Upward Bound participants enrolling in college [Target: 70% for FY 2008]	Dec. 2011	Dec. 2010	Met
	C. Percentage of career and technical education students who have transitioned to postsecondary education or employment by December of the year of graduation [Target: 90% for FY 2008]	Dec. 2011	Dec. 2010	Not met
	D. Percentage of full-time degree-seeking undergraduate students at Title IV institutions who were in their first year of postsecondary enrollment in the previous year and are enrolled in the current year at the same institution [Target: 71% for FY 2008]	Dec. 2010	Met	Not met
	E. Percentage of full-time degree-seeking undergraduate students at Historically Black Colleges and Universities who were in their first year of postsecondary enrollment in the previous year and are enrolled in the current year at the same institution [Target: 66% for FY 2008]	Dec. 2010	Not met*	Not met
	F. Percentage of full-time degree-seeking undergraduate students at Hispanic-Serving Institutions who were in their first year of postsecondary enrollment in the previous year and are enrolled in the current year at the same institution [Target: 68% for FY 2008]	Dec. 2010	Met	Not met
	G. Percentage of students enrolled at all Title IV institutions completing a four-year degree within six years of enrollment [Target: 57% for FY 2008]	Jan. 2011	Met	Met
	H. Percentage of freshmen participating in Student Support Services who complete an associate's degree at original institution or transfer to a four-year institution within three years [Target: 27.5% for FY 2008]	Dec. 2010	Met	Not met
	I. Percentage of first-time full-time degree-seeking undergraduate students enrolled at 4-year Historically Black Colleges and Universities graduating within six years of enrollment [Target: 39% for FY 2008]	Dec. 2010	Not met	Not met*
	J. Percentage of students, enrolled at 4-year Hispanic-Serving Institutions graduating within six years of enrollment [Target: 37% for FY 2008]	Dec. 2010	Met	Met

Key:

* Not met but improved over prior years

** Data not collected

NA = No measure for period

		Performance Results Summary	FY 2009	FY 2008	FY 2007
	K.	Percentage of postsecondary career and technical education students who have completed a postsecondary degree or certification [Target: 47% for FY 2008]	Dec. 2011	Dec. 2010	Not met
3.2.	.2. Deliver student financial aid to students and parents effectively and efficiently				
	A.	Direct administrative unit costs for origination and disbursement of student aid (total cost per transaction) [Target: \$4.15 for FY 2008]	Met	Met	Met
	B.	Customer service level on the American Customer Satisfaction Index for the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) on the Web [Target: 83 points for FY 2008]	Met	Met	Not met
	C.	Pell Grant improper payments rate [Target: 3.48% for FY 2008]	Not met*	Not met*	Not met
	D.	Direct Loan recovery rate [Target: 19.75% for FY 2008]	Not met	Met	Met
	E.	Federal Family Education Loan recovery rate [Target: 19.50% for FY 2008]	Not met	Met	Met
3.3.	Pre	epare adult learners and individuals with disabilities for higher education	n, employme	ent and produ	ictive lives
	A.	Percentage of state vocational rehabilitation agencies that meet the employment outcome standard for the Vocational Rehabilitation State Grants program [Target: 76% for FY 2008]	Apr. 2010	Met	Met
	B.	Percentage of adults served by the Adult Education State Grants program with a high school completion goal who earn a high school diploma or recognized equivalent [Target: 53% for FY 2008]	Feb. 2010	Met	Met
	C.	Percentage of adults served by the Adult Education State Grants program with a goal to enter postsecondary education or training who enroll in a postsecondary education or training program [Target: 39% for FY 2008]	Feb. 2010	Met	Met
	D.	Percentage of adults served by the Adult Education State Grants program with an employment goal who obtain a job by the end of the first quarter after their program exit quarter [Target: 41% for FY 2008]	Feb. 2010	Met	Met
Stra	tegi	c Goal 4—Cross-Goal Strategy on Management			
4.1.		intain and strengthen financial integrity and management and internal	controls	T	1
	A.	Maintain an unqualified (clean) audit opinion [Target: Unqualified for FY 2008]	Met	Met	Met
	B.	Achieve and maintain compliance with the Federal Information Security Management Act of 2002 [Target: Compliant for FY 2008]	Not met	Not met	Met
	C.	Percentage of new discretionary grants awarded by June 30 [Target: 70% for FY 2008]	Not met	Not met	Met
4.2.	4.2. Improve the strategic management of the Department's human capital				
	A.	Percentage of employees believing that leaders generate high levels of motivation and commitment [Target: 34% for FY 2008]	Not met*	Not met	Met

Key:

* Not met but improved over prior years

** Data not collected

NA = No measure for period

	Performance Results Summary	FY 2009	FY 2008	FY 2007
	B. Percentage of employees believing that managers review and evaluate the organization's progress toward meeting its goals and objectives [Target: 59% for FY 2008]	Not met	Not met	Met
	C. Percentage of employees believing that steps are taken to deal with a poor performer who cannot or will not improve [Target: 31% for FY 2008]	Not met	Not met	Met
	 D. Percentage of employees believing that department policies and programs promote diversity in the workplace [Target: 52% for FY 2008] 	Not met	Not met*	Not met*
	E. Percentage of employees believing that they are held accountable for achieving results [Target: 83% for FY 2008]	Not met	Met	Met
	F. Percentage of employees believing that the workforce has the job- relevant knowledge and skills necessary to accomplish organizational goals [Target: 71% for FY 2008]	Not met	Not met	Met
	G. Average number of days to hire is at or below the OPM 45-day hiring model for non-SES	Met	Met	Met
	H. Percentage of employees with performance standards in place within 30 days of start of current rating cycle [Target: 90% for FY 2008]	Met	Met	Not met
	I. Percentage of employees who have ratings of record in the system within 30 days of close of rating cycle [Target: 95% for FY 2008]	Not met	Met	Met
4.3.	Achieve budget and performance integration to link funding decisions to re	esults		
	A. Percentage of Department program dollars in programs that demonstrate effectiveness in terms of outcomes, either on performance indicators or through rigorous evaluations [Target: 88% for FY 2008]	Met	Met	Met

Key:

* Not met but improved over prior years

** Data not collected

NA = No measure for period